

---

**Towards the new “frontiers” of a democratic global order as the basis of international relations and the principles of international law**

Jason Barnwell

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.12745068](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12745068)

---

Follow this and additional works at:

<https://inteulm.free.nf/index.php/inteulm/issue/view/2>

---

**Recommended Citation**

Barnwell, J. (2024). Towards the new “frontiers” of a democratic global order as the basis of international relations and the principles of international law. *International and European Union Legal Matters (INTEULM)*, vol. 1, n. 1, 5-47, Article 1

Available at:

<https://inteulm.free.nf/index.php/inteulm/issue/view/2>

This article is brought to you for free and open access by CEIJ. It has been accepted for inclusion in International and European Union Legal Matters (INTEULM). For more information, please contact: [inteulm@gmail.com](mailto:inteulm@gmail.com)

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.12745068](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12745068)

**Towards the new “frontiers” of a democratic global order as the basis of international relations and the principles of international law**

Jason Barnwell, post Ph.D in international public law, UK

**Abstract:** The present work has attempted to put an order to the various poles that exist in our days in various countries and are incorporated in the context of international law. The balance between West and East, between past and future, between international organizations and large countries is now a never-ending reality for the new global world of frontiers that seek to put into practice and resolve the problems of the past, the new crises as well as laid the foundations for the near future. Democracy, the principles of the United Nations for peace and

resolution of disputes according to the principles of the UN Charter as well as the principles of peace and international security have moved to a new reality where through cooperation, collaboration between old and new countries, between new and old alliances seek to play the leading role in the history of international law.

**Keywords:** NATO; European Union; frontiers of democracy; BRICS; Visegrad group; west; east; Asia; Mediterranean; G7; G20.

### **The new North-Euro-Atlantic front**

World life has changed in recent years and represents a great challenge on the international law stage, especially due to one of its important objectives, that is international peace and security. This change is based on systems of collective, regional security through a new border that includes countries of the Euro-Atlantic

zone, Baltic and the Visegrad group. The protection of human rights in collective group borders are understood as borders of a susceptible democracy, referred to as the wall to the west and east on the European continent. They are ways of guaranteeing modern peace through partial solutions to a total unblocking of international life.

The crisis of the walls concluded in the East-West has obviously affected the nature of the state and above all the rule of law and global democracy.

The transformation measures, which are not always of a legal nature, have prevailed over the legal regimes of emergencies and normality such as those of fragmentation of international institutions and international relations.

The continuous crises including that of the pandemic have determined the path to a new goal without illusions that nourishes the capacity of the old history of globalization, thus transforming the area into a new era of continuous crises.

The transformation of the Atlantic Alliance, of the North Atlantic and Euro-Atlantic communities from 1949 until today is now a

never-ending reality. A community of states in North America and Western Europe which include the Baltic states and central Europe such as the Visegrad group since 2011 and those countries in the north-south-east, i.e. the Western Balkans since 2022-2023.

The geostrategic objectives that are linked with the birth of an eastern border especially after the invasion of Ukraine with the number one danger i.e. the Russian federal republic, has put NATO in a global position in order to defend democracy. The European freedom within the dimensions of a new NATO which we call global, is protected by its new alliances with the countries of the North and East Pacific, i.e. with countries such as Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

The new global, universal model also includes the European Union through a transition phase to an external economic framework where energy supplies are now paid at high prices. On the other hand we have the search for independent energy towards the borders of eastern countries through new solidarity policies, towards the circulation of flows of migrant workers

coming from the southern Mediterranean and the northern part of Africa.

This is a situational reality of the internal and external policies of the EU common foreign and defense policy. In practice, the EU depends on its Euro-Atlantic position with connections to other countries as energy suppliers, such as for example the participation of the UN and Norway.

The European Union during and after the pandemic crisis achieved a period of transition to an economic and political framework, reaching its peak in the crisis of the war in Ukraine and Israel.

The sectors that received the most changes were focused on the Stability Pact, recovery and resilience programs, state aid and technology, reception policies and related distribution for migratory flows.

Thus the external borders of the Union have obtained a common character of interventions which have obtained a combination between connections with countries from the north and the south of the world, i.e. to a new framework of global south to an

economic, diplomatic, political sector where the interventions in air countries for regional cooperation in South Africa and Latin America are committed to peace especially in the Ukrainian area.

### **The Euro-Asian border and democracy in the eastern area**

While we talk about the crisis in the East, the discussion of the future of democracy in the West and the East is immediately put on the table. Different ideas, worlds and ideologies diversified by the past of progressive legal paths, reformism and cosmopolitan and universal schemes.

The conservative wing and the restoration of the idea of the nation and imperial state are part of a framework of common values that respect the freedom of peoples, as geopolitical and economic solutions that are a thriving part of the near future.

The crisis in the East-West zone is a crisis at a continuous level of comparison for the history of Nations. Western integration and democracy have left the traditions of the old empires from the past where the democracies of the East have remained connected

with a tradition of the Slavic people, in Northern and Southern Europe who have restored and preserved an imperial tradition of the nation state in the past. However, in recent years the results have changed towards new paths of thought and reality.

Democracy in the East on the Euro-Asian border presents itself as a democracy of a nation-state where public international law presents itself as a guarantee of the international community, of a pluralistic and multipolar nature.

This is a reality that defends the Euro-Atlantic front towards an idea of global regulation based on the primacy of the West, North America and the European continent.

Within this framework, the Russian presidency of the UN Security Council in April 2023 found itself in a spirit of harmony with the People's Republic of China.

The G7 and from the eastern area, the BRICS group are two political realities for the near future. In particular, the G7 presented itself as a leader in global economy and democracy. Especially in recent years the BRICS are presented as a group of leaders at the level of democracy and economy where the



traditions of the old imperial cities and international capitals are a different baptized reality in the economic sector. Are the ideologies of the past now part of a distant past?

It is an idea based on the nation-state where the state-empire towards globalization of a pluralistic nature is fragmented and the creation of the group of five countries that are part of the BRICS formed the basis for a new proposal, i.e. for a model of international order which is linked with the domestic, national imperial traditions of the founding states to an emerging group. Thus the national-imperial states that are common to the BRICS countries are part of the form of state and government of large spaces that now have a global and common nature.

For the foreseeable future, groups of states between East and West should form a reality between the old nation-states and the empire.

Within this framework, the G20 in today's reality asks for a form of common governance in the face of the Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Asian reality where countries in the Indo-Pacific area, i.e. countries such as Indonesia, South Korea, are consolidated and

coordinated in a much larger organization, that is Australia, Latin America with Argentina and Mexico and the Middle East with Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia.

Within this post-global crisis the current evidence of the search for a vision of the world presents itself as a theory that risks for major emergencies to declassify war events to a transitional phase that resolves common solidarity not within the rules of the EU but through a reality of global recovery.

### **The Euro-Mediterranean border**

Another border in the Euro-Mediterranean area has been created, intended as a meeting bridge between states which are positively presented as “walls” towards the East-West war, political and economic crises.

The northern and southern borders of the Mediterranean form European countries and influence the Middle East, North Africa and generally the Arab-Islamic world.

This is a different way to demonstrate the responsibility of the

traditional borders in the West and the Arab East, that are borders between Europe and Islam, as denoted by the Arab League and addressed by the Ukrainian president in Saudi Arabia in May 2023.

The related democracy groups include the Euro-Mediterranean front as the interlude of Europe where Islam and the Arab world and above all North Africa with ISIS and the old fundamentalism express the idea of a complex democracy.

East and West have found a third path, the juridical-democratic one. The war in Ukraine as well as in Israel respects the thoughts of the countries of the Arab League which are expressed during the meeting in Jeddah in May 2023.

The objectives are certainly far from international peace and security but achieved on the Euro-Mediterranean borders through diplomatic channels to save the Ukrainian question without however a concrete result until now.

The Istanbul agreements relating to maritime security and the circulation of grain in the Ukrainian area towards Mediterranean ports are programs of international conferences which had as

their objective the reconstruction of a post-conflict in Ukraine. But this is a reality only in theory and too distant in practice. Like the old Marshall plan of a financial, economic nature which was aimed at an integration of NATO military aid. Now the humanitarian reception of Ukrainian refugees to countries in the southern and central part of Europe, i.e. the Visegrad group, is a reality for the international table of people who build peace and security through the values of democracy. The Euro-Mediterranean democracies are now an indispensable reality through a bridge with the European Union which is valid and work for the unity in its own continent. EU's final objectives are the solution to the crisis in Ukraine and Israel, i.e. between East and West. The growth of a new internal and external global law finds common traditions in the Mediterranean East as well as in the Arab one. There is no shortage of Western Mediterranean traditions, the ancient imperial forms of integration and union are formed between nation-states which are also part of the EU, i.e. the Maghreb and the African Union.

Reconstruction plans for Ukraine after the conflict are plans that aim to prevent war damage to Russia's products in Ukraine.

Measures of necessity and urgency are necessary to erase the endless suffering of the people during the war. Religious and political leaders, through initiatives for the return of Ukrainians who are deported to Russian territory, have an experience that goes beyond war compensation, through the populations who are residents for future reconstructions.

Thus the Euro-Mediterranean front as a frontier of democracy in a space of democratic security works for the geopolitical stability and sustainability of the area in a complementary way that respects the other two, namely the Euro-Atlantic borders and the extreme defense for the freedoms, those in the Euro-Asian area for the conservation and restoration of traditional and ancient values.

In the Ukrainian crisis, the legal regime for post-conflict reconstruction includes important institutions for accountability, compensation and reparation.

We are talking about responsibility that is linked to illicit, illegal war operations and operations against the Ukrainian state, also including victims among the civilian population and infrastructure. Another type of responsibility includes illicit, illegal operations involving the war against the Ukrainian state, infrastructure, civilian population. The related operation also covers war damage, structures and people of the state that are under armed attack.

Of course, within this framework, compensation as a minimum point not of reference but of practice concerns the protection of the civilian population where the consequences of the violence and deportations of the belligerent state appear through the list of war damages. In this context, the Council of Europe also tried to give its support to accounting for the peace negotiations at the session in Reykjavík (Iceland).

**The countries of the EU via East and West. What is the future for democracy?**

The mediation between West and East and the role of some countries of the EU have played an important role imposing measures that have followed the path of diplomacy and political agreements.

NATO objectives are also added in the G7 countries, after Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Singapore. The frontier of abstentions in the evaluation of the behavior between Ukraine and Russia had always been opposed to the sanctions adopted in the Euro-Atlantic European countries against Russia as well as against corporate citizens. The main topic and objective was peace and democracy, also taking into consideration the situation of Russian geopolitics towards the West in the Council of Europe and of the G7 which is part of an eastern front towards the five BRICS countries (China, India, South Africa, Brazil).

Ukraine's application for membership in the EU is presented as a step towards integration on the Euro-Atlantic and Western border

where the other Central European and Balkan countries are joined. The Black Sea thus followed the path of Westernization as a new frontier of the EU. The related sanctions measures, from an economic point of view, are taken in good faith but without the result thought *ad initio* (Bird, Amagglobeli, 2022; Suslov, Čejka, Đorđević, 2023).

Of course, economic sanctions have led to continued violence and restrictions against the movement of goods, people, businesses, capital and technologies for Russia. The seizure of assets and holders of financial, political and economic positions against Russian oligarchy was a reality that was commented not only from an economic point of view, but also from a legal, political and ideological one, especially for the coverage of expenses (Siddi, 2020).

A state that has been hit on the economic front, has also controlled the list that was created by the EU, such as lists of proscription of citizens that frame a policy of Western borders where the defense of values have dedicated space in local-military crises on an eastern border where Ukraine has thus also



accelerated the road towards the EU (Knoblock, 2020).

### **Domestic democracies**

The diplomacy of the EU, as well as of countries that are not part of the European context, have and continue to play an important role in the global crisis for domestic democracies, thus measuring the exercise of public powers. Balances are difficult to maintain in powers such as presidentialism and parliamentarianism.

The inside and outside borders are of Western-style democracies of an autocratic nature like that of the East when the pacifistic nature and the military and political oligarchies are taken into consideration as the bases for armed interventions and their own wars (Abbenhuis, Tames, 2022).

Global democracies are also the result of domestic democracies where the comparison between constitutions and constitutional practice have played an important role for the stability of the bodies of each government as well as between Western democracies and Eastern autocracies, as parameters of

representativeness, efficiency and public power.

Old theories of parliamentarism is now a comprehensive path given that it represents a basis of political systems between states of East and West. The form is different given that the parameters offer a political representation of states of a political nature, of peoples and parties through representations that come from political parties and lobbies of all kinds.

Western democracies thus offer the representation of forms that guarantee pluralism, the autonomy of each democratic parliament as the basis for the production of laws. This is a representation towards the democracies of the East in a more restricted way not for peoples and states but for the political parties that are present in electoral systems of a single-party or of majority nature (Takenana, Um, 2022).

In the G7 countries, between ancient and modern traditions of a democratic, liberal constitutional nature, various new theories have circulated regarding the balance and performance of parliamentary institutions.

We mean of state sovereignty over its territory where it determines the application of its laws to citizens and foreigners for the security of the state. On the other hand, populism presents itself as a people in possession of sovereignty who find themselves at the center of a political path that restores national and supranational governments and institutions.

A conservation policy is a reality for the restoration of domestic and supranational objects and institutions. Thus, neo-nationalists become an indispensable factor for internal but also international politics for the West and the East.

Within this context, traditional forms of government are the basis of confirmation for the regimes of primacy of parliamentarianism where the distinction of Head of State and government are the demonstration that elections for these high offices are the basis of contemporary democracy.

Prerogatives and new functions are strengthened towards the needs of a normative, emergency life in the era of the global crisis. In a global society, traditional forms designate the forms of

state, republic and monarchy for nations. So, the forms of unions of states that adopt a common sovereign are strengthened.

We talk about the British Commonwealth as a regime of Great Britain where after Brexit it presents its old power between the union of Australia and Canada which the latter recognizes the English sovereign and attributes to the British crown an important role for the president of the Canadian state and Australian (Zwierlein, 2022).

### **The future of European democracy**

The European constitutions have included representative, domestic and of the EU democracy, according to the clauses that are part of the national constitutions and the European treaties of the states that are founders for the authorization of membership according to the crisis of 2022-2023 in Ukrainian and Israeli.

The European clause included in the Constitution Treaty imposed the commitment of a constitutional nature for an organization that followed the path to the charter of human rights as well as to

ensure and enjoy democratic, civil and political, social, economic rights (Celeste, 2022).

The European Parliament continues to ensure respect for democratic values and standards for the future of Europe. Powers continue to be expanded through the transition of a single market that includes the internal space of freedom, security and justice as well as the external space of a common foreign and defense policy.

The institutional bodies are subject to a political direction where control finds its balance between internal law and the same. The European Parliament has sought to guarantee the values of an internationalized democracy to an external and internal policy of the EU.

Especially after the Ukrainian crisis, the objectives of giving greater security and independence to the energy sector on the borders between the North and South East is now a reality. The North Atlantic, Baltic and Visegrad Group borders are part of the North and South Western borders with strong clashes of values and policies respecting Russia regarding the crisis of 2022-2023

during and after the invasion and also the accession of parts of Ukrainian territory to the EU.

On the other hand, the role of NATO-EU and the membership of Finland, Sweden are prospects for the near future of a subsequent membership of Ukraine itself after the attacks that are now clear to the entire West (Rokicki, 2020; Hilmarsson, 2023).

The original form of a three-level European presidentialism of community, national, regional type are identifiers of forms that strengthen the old chancellors that we had in the empires of the past (Braun, 2021; Mišik, Oravcovà, 2021).

### **Towards a decentralized, pluralistic and/or global democracy?**

The war situation in Ukraine as well as in Israel in recent months has allowed us to talk about the new perspectives of a globalized area where the traditions of the past between West and East and the local crisis are the consequences of geopolitical and economic instability in various levels of organization to a global

society.

Global and multipolar pluralism, central and regional governments are fragmented after the outbreak of the crisis of 2022-2023. At the level of the United Nations all prospects for leading and saving lives during armed conflicts is a never-ending reality.

Within this context, we also remember the role of the International Monetary Fund as well as the regional conferences for the adoption of related recovery plans (Carey, 2021; Fechter, Schiwittay, 2021; Anastasiou, 2023).

In the multipolar and multilateral world we are experiencing, forms of global governance are transforming in a decentralized and centralized way.

The same crisis in the history of the UN in 2022-2023 demonstrated that the control for phenomena of armed aggression against its member states and its specific institutions, in response to food emergencies, refugee flows and the control of nuclear power plants that are present in Ukraine, is a reality in practice.

The solutions that are given have had a prism of multiple solutions of the Ukrainian crisis and the management of various mediations by states such as China and Turkey to the authorities of a leadership also recognized by a global religious recognition such as the Holy See.

The transportation of Ukrainian food resources and the ceasefire mitigate the humanitarian consequences, the deportation of Ukrainian minors on Russian territory.

The regionalization of global security has resulted in global mobilization by regional, domestic organizations and groups of states. The final objective is to support the opposing parties in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict and spontaneous mediation initiatives.

The Council of Europe recently through the session of Iceland, Reykjavík on 16 May 2023 tried to put on the table a register for the damage caused to Ukraine for future reconstruction through financing obtained from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.



Thus the old projects of global security and regional cooperation have a position not only European, regional but also international and extra-European. Within this context, the Council of Europe created the relevant register for war damage in Ukraine with greater support from Member States and with exceptions from the Euro-Atlantic front, i.e. countries such as Turkey, Armenia, Serbia, Hungary.

These are organizations that speak for regional cooperation in South Africa and South America under the basis of a now global South that is on an equal footing with Northern countries that have now all been destroyed after the Ukrainian and Israeli crises.

Institutional groups such as the G/7 and BRICS presented for support that respects countries such as Russia and Ukraine. In such a context they have emerged ideologies of a bi-communal Europe that finds itself divided on the Euro-Atlantic and Euro-Asian fronts.

The G/7 goes beyond the European border as a security zone in the Indo-Pacific base and faces competition problems especially

with China. Thus the BRICS represents a global media entity due to the help of countries such as China, South Africa and Brazil.

These are the same institutional groups that during the first year of war in Ukraine fiercely demonstrated their positions against the conflict. During the second year they tried to maintain a low profile towards the role of mediator. In particular, the G7 and the BRICS followed the visions that were opposed for the reasons of the contenders. In practice, the venue for talks and related visits were continuous for US and EU capitals as well as diplomatic missions in Kiev and Moscow (China and the Republic of South Africa).

Additionally, the Arab League during the session in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia on 18 May 2023) invited the Ukrainian president himself to open a dialogue similar to the one that has been going on for years in the Arab-Islamic world (De Coning, Saraiva, Muto, 2023; Weiss, Wilkinson, 2023).

**The role of the G7 between the West and the global world**

Over the years the G7 has characterized itself as a laboratory mixture of substances of global law between various traditions and values which include the American and East Asian group, i.e. Japan, on the map of the international community.

Within this context, we have some nice principles of the world order which include the prohibition of armed intervention, the continuous integration between states and the universal citizenship of the person, of every human being.

The G7 presents itself as a multilateral summit of coordination between Western leaders and loved ones of the euro with positions that demonstrate their power with common decisions.

Adversely, coordination with organizations and bodies of the EU, during the work of the G7, is a functional connection with organizations, representatives and/or leaders and leading states from an economic, political and global influence point of view (Larionova, Kirton, 2018; Oldani, Wouters, 2021)<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>The G7 in the Hiroshima summit, held between 19 and 21 May 2023,

The values of Western democracy from the American point of view as a global democracy through the G7 represent the connection with third states and with organizations, groups from various continents. The formulas it uses are the general invitation to participate in works and summits but also in parallel and simultaneous summits that seek to resolve emergency issues. In particular, in 2023 the G7 asked China to organize a summit in collaboration with Beijing and the Arab League held in Jeddah relating to the situation of the Ukrainian crisis (Kirton, Larionova, 2021).

The objective of invitations to third countries and/or third states is the global regulation which has as its main attempt the equitable peace in every conflict as well as in the Russian-

---

invited President Zelenski as well as two presidents from BRICS, namely Lula of Brazil and Modi of India showing their geoeconomic, geopolitical role in a connection between NATO and EU. This is a formula of a diplomatic nature between the American G7 and the European G7, i.e. between Great Britain, the United States and Canada. The main perspectives are of an elitist nature for the BRICS side to overcome the dissociation of the vision of the organization itself.

Ukrainian war through the world peace conference through specialized conferences and the reconstruction of a continuous, permanent, temporary, occasional step towards a final and unfeigned peace. Similar positions we noted at the Hiroshima summit in May 2023 as a practice, task of the G7 in Italy (Oates, 2022)<sup>2</sup>.

### **Global BRICS and Eastern Frontier**

In parallel with the G7 group, the five BRICS states can be seen where, with their connections outside and inside their territory,

---

<sup>2</sup>During the holding of the Euro-Western G7, Japan was the only Asian state that was close to free European and American democracy. Spirits who also during the G7 summit in the city of Hiroshima supported the position of nuclear disarmament and atomic pacifism as a type of remedy for the relative management of regional crises in the area, i.e. North Korea, Taiwan. The global economy has relied on supporting the position of cooperation with countries in the global south. This is a formula that has included the countries of the Indo-Pacific area and South-East Asia as well as those of South America and the South Pacific, i.e. Australia, New Zealand.

try to play an important role on the international scene. Russia and China, as the two global and large countries in terms of territory and people, play an autonomous role in the defense and values of Eastern democracy and in the management of ongoing crises. In particular, Russia has always tried to reduce the military presence in a unilateral way and consolidate a situation for the states that are minor and part of the BRICS.

These are operating with a certain autonomy and negotiation through mediation and support solutions. Countries such as India, South Africa and Brazil belong to this category.

The G7 has sought to broaden its functional connections which correspond to a group of BRICS states, thus reinforcing the complementary nature of the relevant agreements.

The group from the beginning had a heterogeneous character for the political regimes and which also presents itself in reality in the Russian-Chinese agreement of February 2022 and in relation to the alliance characterized as “eternal and stainless”.

The two infamous leaders, namely of Ukraine and Taiwan are of global nature and, in reality, are linked from a geographical point

of view (Loginova, Mikheeva, 2021).

Within this framework, in the BRICS the role of Brazil is found in a particular and difficult situation between East and West, expressing an institutional line of American nature and belonging to inter-American organizations between North and South in a global space of the South that respects the relative recognition for cooperation, economic-political stability in relation to the Ukrainian crisis destined to find a relative precise solution (Kirton, Larionova, 2020)<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup>Brazil was part of the BRICS group and was linked to third states after a series of agreements which resulted in following the path of integration and commercial development over time. The original agreements for pan-American security from the organization of the American states from 1948 as well as the economic agreements in the Latin American context (ALALC, ALADI, 1950-1970), and the economic and environmental pacts with neighboring countries were an economic and political reality. Brazil has thus obtained the path of a leading country also on agreements in the South American context (MERCOSUR-UNASUR), thus becoming an important exponent of southern globalism.

As regards India and South Africa, the connection through the G7 and BRICS represents a status of members who are part of the British Commonwealth. A persistent thread between them is the relationship of union between the crown of the English monarchy and the staff who are seeking the path of the logic of a global Great Britain at least in theory in the political and economic sector. On the other hand, India has sought a security space at the Asian level where the Indo-Pacific, South-East and North-East Asia areas are a reality that presents a new third pole, a group of different ideologies and objectives between the African Union and North Africa (Jalilvand, Westphal, 2021)<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup>India and South Africa as parts of the BRICS group and as leading countries in the Indo-Pacific region respect the values of South Asia as well as South Africa. The states are also members of the British Commonwealth therefore we saw the birth of the Pacific NATO through the session of 15 August 2021 which included the military-naval agreement with countries like India, New Zealand, Australia, Japan.



**The global G20 and the east-west frontier**

The role of the G20 group in the near future seems to be a difficult one to balance due to the global coexistence that can be seen between various models of democracy. On the one hand, we have the Euro-Atlantic democracy together with the European, American one. The G20 states have common problems and solutions that are difficult to deal with new issues such as climate, security and welfare.

On the other hand, the Euro-Asian zone with the largest exponent Russia allows spaces in the Black Sea, in the Balkan area and in the BRICS area in the general assembly of the UN with isolated votes in the various states of the continents (Kirton, 2019).

The G20 also dealt not only with the crisis in Ukraine but also with northern Kosovo, during 2023, due to the plaques of the four Albanian mayors in the Serb-majority areas. Thus occurred the related attacks by groups aimed at NATO forces, the wounding of Alpine troops in the Julia area and the birth of a new G20 representing the leaders of all the continents at a common

cooperation summit, coordination between the G7, BRICS, etc.

This was a new model of an elitist nature where it presents in an egalitarian way the collective representation of countries that also include Asian states, from Europe, America and the Middle East and Africa. It is a harbinger of an Eastern democracy of egalitarian choice.

The solution to the Ukrainian-Russian conflict has allowed the G20 to offer and find an institutional solution with the prospect of the peace conference in Paris in July 2023 where the groups of a somewhat strange diplomatic troika in the history of diplomacy are presented, that of the G7, BRICS and the Arab League represented by Saudi Arabia.

The diplomatic formula was a way of experimentation that was born from the experience of parallel and simultaneous summits that are held at a particular moment, of a dispute, crisis where it was being discussed at another international forum that in Hiroshima, Beijing, Jeddah.

In the Hiroshima summit between 19 and 21 May 2023 Brazil and India were invited as joint members of the BRICS. This was an

important reality for the future of the frontiers of democracy of international law (Hajnal, 2019).

However, the G20 summit continues to be a summit of cooperation and collaboration between West and East, i.e. between the Euro-Asian and Euro-Atlantic East.

It was a summit that respected the Ukrainian issue through a group of last resort between neighbors and different countries in the current political and economic world. The manager of the war through missions and peace proposals are the spokesperson for territorial clauses for future peace agreements where Russia had as its objective the passage from Ukraine towards Crimea and the two republics of southern Ukraine which it invaded even before 2022.

The G20 tried to validate and conquer a third pole which has constituted a discussion table of regional groups maintaining a distance between the leading countries in the Middle East (between Turkey and Saudi Arabia) and in Africa (between South Africa and Ethiopia) on issues that have emerged in the geopolitical-economic crisis of 2023-2023.

The future of the G20 is now a reality that depends on mediation and a new composition in the area. The final objective is the creation of a third Euro-Mediterranean hub in a free trade area between the African Union and the EU. The project's objectives aim to overcome Africa's status under global leadership. An area that goes beyond the current level of trade also extending to workers, services and businesses as an inevitable reality for the coming years (Slaughter, 2020)<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup>The G20 as a group that comprises Euro-Asian and Euro-Atlantic groups actually presents itself as a hub of states between the Middle East and Africa. It is now part of a history of global law that is based on a continuous comparison of the processes of new rights that come from various continents.

**Conclusions**

Within the new frontiers of a global democracy, the common basis of the international community and the Euro-global perspectives are now a new reality of a global nature both of a domestic and international level for each country. The crisis of 2022-2023 has now paved the way for a balance in relations between countries of eastern democracy.

Within this new scene, the EU has participated, like it or not, in a new phase of globalization where on the one hand the decadence of the old West has been noted and on the other hand the resilience of a transition for geopolitical security and economy has been shown for future generations.

The global outlook shifts to economic stability which is also addressed through the EU for a continuing crisis combined with the end of the health pandemic with a military, political crisis which has experimented with new stability mechanisms for the resolution of disputes at a global level.

Mechanisms for the resolution of disputes which have not yet found a final solution given that the wars continue in both Ukraine and Iran and the overcoming of global instability at a diplomatic and military level is now over.

A new direction has been born for a new reality for international law that seeks to resolve international crises towards a balance in the global borders between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean as well as between Eastern Europe, the Baltic countries, Africa and the United States.

A flourishing of states that are part of forums, international organizations where the military and political apparatuses find a way of discussion to resolve conflicts towards greater conflict management based on institutional and representative democracy from a European perspective, as the founders of a common home in the Atlantic and beyond.

Perhaps the past has now been conquered and we are the new witnesses for a new, different future where the lessons of the past are over and are part of an important legacy at all levels to

conquer the near future on a global level.

**References**

Abbenhuis, M., Tames, I. (2022). *Global war, global catastrophe: neutrals, belligerents and the transformations of the first world war*. Bloomsbury Publisher, New York.

Anastasiou, H. (2023). *The war on terror and terror of war: Bellicose Nationalism versus peace and democracy*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham.

Bird, N., Amaglobeli, D. (2022). *Policies to address the refugee crisis in Europe related to Russia's invasion of Ukraine*. IMF, London:

<https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/IMF-Notes/Issues/2022/09/08/Policies-to-Address-the-Refugee-Crisis-in-Europe-Related-to-Russias-Invasion-of-Ukraine-522662>

Braun, M. (2021). *The politics of regional cooperation and the impact on the European Union: a study of Nordic cooperation and the Visegrad group*. Edward Elgar Publishers, Cheltenham.

Carey, H.F. (ed.). (2021). *Peacebuilding paradigms: The impact of theoretical diversity on implementing sustainable peace*.



Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Celeste, E. (2022). *Digital constitutionalism: the role of internet bills of rights*. ed. Routledge, London, New York.

De Coning, C., Saraiva, R., Muto A. (eds.). (2023). *Adaptive peacebuilding: a new approach to sustaining peace in the 21st century*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Fechter, A.M., Schiwittay, A. (eds.). (2021). *Citizen aid and everyday humanitarianism: development futures?*. Routledge, New York.

Hajnal, P.I. (2019). *The G20: evolution, interrelationships, documentation, II ed.* Taylor and Francis, London.

Hilmarsson, H.T. (2023). *The Nordic, Baltic and Visegrád small powers in Europe: a dance with giants for survival and prosperity*. ed. Routledge, New York.

Jalilvand, D.R., Westphal, W. (eds.). (2021). *The political and economic challenges of energy in the Middle East and North Africa*. Routledge, New York.

Kirton, J.J. (2019). *China's G20 leadership*. Routledge, New York.

Kirton, J.J., Larionova, M. (eds.). (2020). *BRICS and global governance*. Routledge, New York.

Kirton, J.J., Larionova, M. (eds.). (2021). *Accountability for effectiveness in global governance*. Routledge, New York.

Knoblock, N. (ed.). (2020). *Language of conflict: discourses of the Ukrainian crisis*. Bloomsbury, New York.

Larionova, M., Kirton, C. (eds.). (2018). *The G8-G20 relationship in global governance*. Routledge, New York.

Loginova, A.S., Mikheeva, L.V. (2021). *The impact of WTO membership: a comparative analysis of China, Russia and Ukraine*. Routledge, New York.

Mišik, M., Oravcovà, V. (eds.). (2021). *From economic to energy transitions. Three decades of transitions in central and eastern Europe*, ed. Springer, Cham

Oates, J.G. (2022). *Constituent power and the legitimacy of international organizations. The constitution of supranationalism*. Routledge, New York.

Oldani, C., Wouters, J. (eds.). (2021). *The G7, anti-globalism and the governance of globalization*. Routledge, New York.

Rokicki, T. (ed.). (2020). *Energy supplies in the countries from the Visegrad group*. MDPI, London.

Siddi, M. (2020). *European identities and foreign policy discourses on Russia: from the Ukraine to the Syrian crisis*. ed. Routledge, London, New York.

Slaughter, S. (2020). *The power of the G20: The politics of legitimacy in global governance*. Routledge, New York.

Suslov, M., Čejka, M., Đorđević, V. (2023). *Panslavism and slavophilia in contemporary Central and Eastern Europe: origins, manifestations and functions*. ed. Springer, Basingstoke.

Takenana, C., Um (eds.). K. (2022). *Globalization and civil society in East Asian space*. Taylor and Francis, London.

Weiss, T.G., Wilkinson, R. (eds.). (2023). *International organization and global governance*. Routledge, New York.

Zwierlein, C. (ed.). (2022). *The power of the dispersed: early modern global travelers beyond integration*. ed. Brill, Leiden.